



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/228,926	04/18/1994	ENZO PAOLETTI	4543102430	4171
20999	7590	11/17/2008	EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			MOSHER, MARY	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		1648		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
11/17/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 08/228,926	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PAOLETTI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Mary E. Mosher	<b>Art Unit</b> 1648

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mary E. Mosher, Bruce Campell. (3) T. Kowalski, attny.

(2) Enzo Paoletti, inventor. (4) R. Garman, attny.

Date of Interview: 13 November 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: Moss patent.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed support for claims in earliest parent; antedating Moss patent by declaration; double patenting arguments; administrative delay, 1-way analysis, appropriateness of rejection based on when claims first entered prosecution as opposed to when application was filed, obviousness-type double patenting versus genus/species domination, possible amendment of inventorship.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Mary E Mosher/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1648